

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| Cortreal Lemont Swinton, #266975, |) | C.A. #4:08-2376-PMD |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | <u>ORDER</u> |
| |) | |
| Warden, Evans Correctional Institution, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |
| |) | |

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In the Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that respondent’s motion for summary judgment be granted. Petitioner filed his timely objections on August 24, 2009.

In conducting this review, the court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendations as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court’s review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge’s findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted). In light of this standard, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report. Accordingly, the magistrate judge’s Report is incorporated into

this order.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that respondent's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

August 28, 2009
Charleston, South Carolina

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order within **thirty (30) days** from the date hereof pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.